DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 244 671 JC 840 257

AUTHOR Jaffe, Phil; And Others
TITLE Faculty Study of Pros and Cons of Clusters and Divisions. Final Report.
INSTITUTION Oakton Community Coll., Des Plaines, IL.
PUB DATE 11 Oct 83
NOTE 21p.; Prepared for the Board of Trustees of Oakton Community College.
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrative Organization; *Cluster Colleges; Community Colleges; *Departments; Interdisciplinary Approach; *Organizational Change; *Teacher Attitudes; Two Year Colleges

ABSTRACT

As part of a reorganization study underway at Oakton Community College, this report presents the pros and cons of retaining the college's interdisciplinary learning clusters or moving to discipline-based divisions. Following introductory material, the report explains the methodology by which two representatives from each campus cluster, one favoring the cluster structure and the other in favor of discipline-based divisions, met with other "pro-cluster" or "pro-division" faculty to identify the benefits of their preferred system and the liabilities of the other system. The next sections present the reports of the "pro-cluster" and "pro-division" faculty groups. Each section includes an introduction, an enumeration of the advantages of the favored system and the disadvantages of the unpreferred system, and conclusions supporting the choice of systems. Conclusions and recommendations are presented next, representing the areas that received the support of the entire committee. For example, the committee agreed that (1) there must be better ongoing orientation to the college's organization and classroom practices for new full- and part-time faculty; (2) support for interdisciplinary courses should continue; (3) if clusters are retained, the number of clusters should not be reduced and the proposed addition of a new administrative layer should be abandoned; and (4) if a change in favor of divisions is implemented, administrative support and faculty participation are essential. Clarifying comments are appended. (AYC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED244671

FINAL REPORT

of the

FACULTY STUDY OF PROS AND CONS OF CLUSTERS AND DIVISIONS

prepared for the Board of Trustees

of

Oakton Community College

October 11, 1983

Study Committee:
Chairman — Phil Jaffe
Co-Chairmen — Mike Matkovich and Bill Taylor
Members — Morita Bailey
Lynda Jerit
Mary Olson
Gary Phillips
Leona Roen
Mary Sextro
Jay Wollin

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

W. A. Koehnline

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

X Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

JC 840 257

FACULTY STUDY OF PROS AND CONS OF CLUSTERS AND DIVISIONS

prepared for the Board of Trustees

of

Oakton Community College

October 11, 1983

Study Committee:	
Chairman	Phil Jaffe
Co-Chairmen	Mike Matkovich and Bill Taylor
Members	Morita Bailey
	Lynda Jerit
	Mary Olson
	Gary Phillips
	Leona Roen
	Mary Sextro
	Jay Wollin

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	page 1
II.	METHODOLOGY	1
III.	PRO-CLUSTER	2
	IIIA. INTRODUCTION	2
	IIIB. ADVANTAGES OF THE CLUSTER SYSTEM	2
	IIIC. DISADVANTAGES OF THE DIVISION SYSTEM	3
	IIID. CONCLUSIONS	3
IV.	PRO-DIVISION	6
	IVA. INTRODUCTION	6
	IVB. ADVANTAGES OF THE DIVISION SYSTEM	6
	IVC. DISADVANTAGES OF THE CLUSTER SYSTEM	8
	IVD. CONCLUSIONS	11
V.	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	12

I. Introduction

We as faculty of Oakton Community College appreciate the opportunity to express our opinions about the issue of whether we should retain interdisciplinary learning clusters or move to discipline-based divisions. Although individual faculty have expressed opinions about this issue in the past, this is the first organized attempt to solicit, discuss, and record faculty thinking.

We approached this task fully aware that there are certain realities which color faculty opinions on this issue. While all faculty can speak to their experiences within a particular cluster(s) at Oakton, many, if not most, of our faculty have had no personal experience with a divisional system, nor is there any uniform understanding of how such a system would be organized or implemented at Oakton.

In order to accurately reflect the diverse opinions of the faculty on this issue, the reporting of data and its analysis and conclusions will be presented in two sections. This separation is maintained in order to preserve the integrity of the arguments on both sides of the issue and is not intended to suggest an irreconcilable difference among the faculty.

II. Methodology

At their August 9th meeting, the Board requested that the Faculty Senate initiate a study of the pros and cons of divisions versus clusters as part of the reorganization study currently under way. At the first faculty meeting of the year faculty were informed of the Board's request for faculty input on this issue. Each cluster was invited to have two representatives on the "Reorganization Study Committee" - one interested in maintaining the cluster system and the other preferring a division-based system.

Cluster meetings on September 12 and 26 were the vehicle for discussion of the issue. The objective of these meetings was to generate thinking about the issue and to obtain a list of the advantages and disadvantages for each system, not to choose sides and vote. Deans convened the meetings and were present throughout. The "pro-cluster" faculty representative recorded benefits of the cluster system and liabilities of the division system. The "pro-division" representative recorded benefits of the division system and liabilities of the cluster system.

After the cluster meetings and after other individual oral and written comments were received, the "Reorganization Study Committee" met to compile the results. These results, along with the recommendations and conclusions drawn from them, follow.

III. PRO-CLUSTER

III A. Introduction

This seems a particularly appropriate time in the history of Oakton to consider the organization of faculty into interdisciplinary learning clusters or discipline-based divisions. Following several years which required our collective attention be focused on developing, maintaining, and then reintegrating a two-campus operation, it is only natural that we now turn to considering whether our organizational structure enhances or inhibits our ability to accomplish our goals. This section reports the responses of faculty who favor an interdisciplinary cluster system.

III. B. Advantages of the Cluster System

1. Faculty develop a wider perspective on:

   a. the needs of the college as a whole: faculty become a part of a common enterprise which helps one get beyond seeing everything from the perspective of one's own discipline;

   b. their own discipline and how it both relates to other disciplines (We deal with the same issue in sociology but from a different point of view...") and how it is perceived by other disciplines ("My job in accounting would be a whole lot easier if you people would do a better job of teaching...");

   c. the multifaceted needs of students.

2. Faculty can draw on the varied expertise of a wide range of fellow cluster members (How do you student development faculty suggest that I deal with a student who...?).

3. The cluster provides a forum for multiple points of view and offers a balance to a provincial or territorial outlook.

4. Faculty can share teaching methods and gain a greater range of teaching strategies.

5. Daily contact among faculty whose offices are close to one another and who regularly attend cluster meetings can result in the development of interdisciplinary courses and programs, tandem courses, and visiting lecturer opportunities in classes of various disciplines. This interdisciplinary richness offers unique opportunities to students.

6. A cluster system allows for transfer of faculty among clusters. This may be used to provide the stimulation of a new group of colleagues, to resolve conflict between individuals, and to group faculty who share particular interests and styles. The potential combination of faculty is endless.

7. Classroom or student problems can be discussed in an interdisciplinary setting to obtain the benefit of multiple perspectives.

8. The cluster system accommodates the student development model which requires that faculty view the student as a whole person, not just the recipient of knowledge.

9. The cluster system better accommodates the changing size of the whole college as well as changing sizes of particular disciplines or vocational programs.

10. Programs can be made available to the entire Oakton faculty (e.g. Coles writing seminar) which draw participants from many disciplines and require funding support and endorsement across discipline lines.

11. The informal faculty advising of students, which is widespread at Oakton, requires faculty to know a cross-section of other faculty, their teaching styles, and academic requirements as resources for that advising.

III. C. DISADVANTAGES OF THE DIVISION SYSTEM

In addition to finding many important advantages in the cluster system, we anticipate that there would be a number of disadvantages if a divisional system were established:

1. Most, if not all, of the advantages of the cluster system would be lost.

2. Either some divisions will be disproportionately large or the college will have to add additional administrative units, with the consequent cost.

3. Because some divisions will include a number of disciplines, it is possible that an additional level of administration will need to be added to deal with the sub-disciplines.

4. Discipline issues will be the primary academic concern dealt with in the divisions.

5. A regimentation may set in that can stifle initiative and creativity.

6. Budgetary conflicts may be exacerbated by heightened we/they rivalries.

7. By appreciably narrowing the scope of faculty contacts, divisions will encourage a tunnel vision.

8. Change to a division system may cause a great deal of disruption in the patterns of relationships with which the faculty are now comfortable, diverting attention and energies from class and student needs.

III. D. CONCLUSION

As a result of our deliberations about this issue, we have come to recognize both the strengths of the present system and other manageable problems which are associated with it. We have viewed organizational structure from a point of view which asks which system might best serve our college's educational mandate.

Our present interdisciplinary structure appears to be more appropriate for a variety of reasons:

1. While a division may be appropriate for a large university, neither faculty nor students at the community college level are specialized enough to take advantage of the merits of a subject-based division system. Our mission is to teach, not to develop new knowledge.

2. The first two years of a college education are most often devoted to the mastery of basic skills, general concepts, and to acquiring a broad-based understanding of the history and development of human thought. Such learning is by its very nature interdisciplinary. A system which encourages contact among faculty across disciplines is most appropriate to serve this function.

3. The size and distribution of the student body among curricula changes and clusters are more responsive to and better able to accommodate such changes without disruption.

4. Faculty from other colleges often openly admire the possibilities a system such as ours would afford. We are encouraged by a widespread national interest in interdisciplinary studies evident in topics at conventions, texts, and major grants to such programs. We feel such national interest is recognition of the academic merit of an interdisciplinary system.

At present, we have only the vaguest notion of the particular shape a division system would assume. We, therefore, can not speak to a particular plan. Even those who have worked in a division system elsewhere or who would suggest we adopt a system based on an existing model can not realistically imagine what the change to divisions would mean at Oakton. We are aware that changing the discipline alignment would have far-reaching implications of which we are only dimly aware. While we can guess what benefits we might gain, we can not realistically calculate our losses.

We see a number of problems which remain unsolved. We also see the source of these problems frequently attributed to the cluster system when such may not be the case. There is the claim that students are confused by the system and are, therefore, not receiving a quality education because of the clusters. Our search leads us to conclude that students are served not by the way a college is organized but by the quality of instruction. Problems associated with confusion over classrooms and how instructors can be located have solutions considerably less radical than dismantling the cluster system.

Certain faculty, notably science faculty, have specialized needs which develop into problems because of the absence of an administrator with a science back ground. The solution to this seems not to require the reorganization of the entire college.

A group of widespread, general problems attributed to the cluster system appear to be caused by the many different ways in which faculty experience the system. We do not share a common definition of what a cluster is. There is agreement that the quality of cluster leadership is uneven. Where leadership is strong, the clusters function much as the model envisions. Where leadership is ineffecutual, the clusters do not function well. In earlier years, everyone who worked at Oakton had a good, general notion of the reasons for clusters and most shared a commitment to their success. During recent years, neither an understanding of nor a commitment to the cluster system has been a requirement for hiring deans and faculty. Neither have new faculty been educated into the theory and practice of a cluster system. While a mediocre college could be run more easily through a more traditional system, clusters require an extraordinary amount of energy and dedication.

Real problems and daily carping to the side, there is a tremendous relectance to give up the richness of interaction with colleagues from other disciplines. The discussions of this issue has generated the kind of excitement and participation which tends to occur most prominenently in an interdisciplinary system. The committee itself has behaved in a true interdisciplinary fashion and reflects the thinking of all five clusters and many individuals.

There are many possibilities short of dismantling the cluster system which can respond to the problems we currently experience. We hope there is the energy and commitment to make it work.

IV. PRO-DIVISION

IVA. Introduction

Oakton Community College was established in 1969 which was a period of student unrest and dissatisfaction with traditional learning experiences. In an attempt to meet the perceived needs of the students, 30 or 40 colleges chose to adopt the cluster system.

Over the past 13 years, this innovative approach has been rejected by all but 3 or 4 colleges in this country.

The main argument for the cluster system was that it promotes inter-disciplinary communication and teaching. After 13 years, this argument is "aged". By this time most of the teachers know each other just as in traditionally organized schools.

An additional argument for the cluster system was that it accomodates growth. Since 1983, enrollment was only 1% above 1982 enrollments and trends predict no substantial further gains. Thus, this argument is no longer relevant.

The division/departmental system remains the preeminent organizational arrangement of colleges and universities throughout the world. It has existed for centuries because it is the best available organizational arrangement for the transmission of knowledge. It is the professional approach to education.

Even at Oakton, the vocational programs are organized along departmental lines. Each vocational area has a coordinator (department head) with all of the teachers from that area grouped together. Vo-tech programs thereby gain coordination and strength from the daily contact of teachers in that area.

Since the inception of the college, the student development faculty have been organized along departmental lines even though they are assigned to clusters. They have their own office, conference room, support staff and leader (Departmental Chairman) at the Vice Presidential level. They hold regular meetings, have a clear line of authority, and in all respects act like a well-organized department.

Conversely, teachers in the baccalaureate programs have been clusterized since the inception of the college. The majority of the teachers supporting the division/departmental system are baccalaureate faculty.

IVB. Advantages of the Division System

1. The division/departmental system is universally accepted and understood throughout the world. It promotes the intellectual development of the student. It emphasizes academic matters. It emphasizes teaching, learning and knowledge. It is this system that stresses the delivery of

education through well organized and tested channels.

2. The division/departmental system promotes curriculum planning and coordination of the long range and day-to-day activities within a discipline. It is a focal point for full-time faculty, part-time faculty, and students with common academic interests. A division/departmental system would bring people with common backgrounds and in related areas of expertise together. It creates an arena where professional stimulation and meaningful innovation can occur.

3. Part-time and new faculty can be better integrated into the college. They can be supervised by a person knowledgeable in their field. They will have a place to go to find answers to their questions and to meet with their professional colleagues. They would have a built-in mentor system. This would result in intensive indoctrination of new instructors into goals, procedures, problems of discipline, resource materials, techniques, etc.

4. Disciplines can be treated more fairly in the budget process. Meaningful budgets can be prepared showing how much money is spent on each discipline. Comparisons can be made between disciplines and from school to school.

5. The division/departmental system is simple, direct and easy to understand. It is understood by members of the Boards of Trustees and the community. It is the same system used by local high schools, universities and other community colleges.

6. The lines of authority are simple and clearly understood. There is one boss and one set of personnel policies. There can be standardization of requirements and procedures.

7. The division/departmental system provides for more communication between students in a particular discipline. An emphasis on subject matter may tend to increase student participation in clubs, exhibits, lectures and departmental activities.

8. The division/departmental system would be easy to adopt; there are many successful models available. The vocational programs are already departmentalized and can easily be incorporated into divisions. Similarly, the student development faculty , who are already departmentalized, could be come part of a division. This rearrangement would cause minimum disruption to the college.

9. We feel that adopting a division/departmental system would enhance Oakton's image and reputation among teachers and administrators at surrounding high schools and colleges. This enhanced image might help to attract more highly qualified students.

10. The more efficient and proper functioning of the science laboratories would be greatly facilitated by a departmental system.

11. Secreterial help would be familiar with subject matter in their disciplines and have no problems typing specialized material such as chemistry and math. Specialized office equipment, such as typewriters that can type chemistry and math could be available in a single location thus avoiding the necessity to have duplicate equipment. This makes for a more efficient and less costly operation.

IVC. Disadvantages of the Cluster System

1. The cluster system de-emphasizes discipline matters. It hinders disciplinary communication, disciplinary cooperation and disciplinary coordination. There is lack of day-to-day coordination of common courses between teachers in the same discipline. The cluster system is "tired and aged". It is not stimulating and most cluster activities are meaningless and nonproductive for the experienced teacher. There is some question as to their value to the new instructors. Cluster meetings are primarily concerned with housekeeping matters.

2. Teachers in a given discipline are difficult to locate. The cluster system randomly scatters teachers throughout the campus because the emphasis is not on subject matter. There is no directory of teachers by discipline. There is no way for an outsider to determine who the teachers in a given discipline are.

3. Students have no easy way of locating teachers in a discipline of interest to them. Part-time teachers usually don't know who the other members of their discipline are or how to contact them or what they are doing in their courses.

4. There is too much time and energy wasted on cluster politics and inter-cluster politics. Teachers may be caught in power struggles between deans. Deans may be caught in power struggles between vice-presidents. As a result, the same problems keep reappearing year after year within the cluster system. In a sense, the cluster system is a political game. Cluster loyalty or cluster power may supercede the interests of the school.

5. The cluster system is hard to explain to anyone who has not worked under the system.

The cluster system is not understood by many part-time faculty teaching in the college.

The cluster system is not understood by most students within the school.

The cluster system is not really understood by many Board members.

6. Because the system is not understood by people outside the school, they have difficulty communicating with people inside the college. Letters from professional organizations, other colleges, governmental agencies and book publishers are usually addressed to the head of a specific department. Important communications may never reach the intended destination. Important mail may never reach part-time teachers. For telephone callers, especially students who want to talk to a teacher or department head of a specific discipline, more often than not, the calls are not completed.

7. To an outsider, the system appears unusual, disorganized and chaotic.

8. Because of the disorganization and chaos of the cluster system, much of the energy of the faculty is dissipated with housekeeping matters.

9. Because of the amorphous nature of the cluster system, financial and educational data are often in a meaningless form. Meaningful comparisons with other colleges cannot be made. Meaningful comparisons within the college are difficult to make. For instance, a considerable amount of administrative work done by faculty is funded as overload pay. It does not show up as released time assignments.

10. The lines of responsibilities between faculty, cluster deans, discipline deans, and vice presidents are confusing, different for different faculty and a murky web of undefined responsibilities. A faculty member in one cluster can have a discipline coordinator in a second cluster, a discipline dean in a third cluster, and of course part-time faculty and other faculty in the same discipline are in the fourth and fifth clusters. Thus, a minimum of three and usually more than five people are needed to coordinate schedules, solve problems and deal with professional development. Important decisions often take more than a year to be made. Often they are not made at all.

11. Part-time faculty are not given proper supervision, support or direction under the cluster system. They are usually assigned to a different cluster than the discipline coordinator. They may even be in clusters in which there are no full-time faculty from their discipline. They are evaluated, if at all, by deans not necessarily trained or knowledgeable in their discipline. Full-time faculty evaluations are not disciplinary.

12. The cluster system is much more expensive than the traditional division/departmental system. There are too many layers of bureaucracy. In March, 1983, Oakton employed the equivalent of 244 full-time teachers and the equivalent of 286 full-time administrators and non-teaching personnel. Thus for every six teachers there were approximately seven non-teaching personnel.

13. The deans are not trained in many of the areas that they supervise. Unlike heads of a division, cluster deans do not have first-hand professional knowledge of many of the disciplines in their cluster. Oakton deans function as managers, but are required to supervise faculty and deal with students in matters beyond their own realm of expertise and training. The many responsibilities of Oakton deans have no clear academic purpose and make for an inefficient system.

14. Because the cluster system is more difficult to understand, the cluster system has a negative image among teachers and administrators of neighboring colleges. Many of them do not regard it as a professional arrangement.

15. Because of many of the reasons cited above, innovation is stifled creativity is twisted, and all too often, morale is depressed.

16. At one time, there were over thirty cluster colleges. Today there are, at most, five. Recently, Moraine Valley and the College of DuPage have gone back to a more traditional system.

IV D. CONCLUSION

1. It is becoming increasingly apparent to almost everyone involved with OCC - faculty, administration, and the Board, that the cluster system is not producing the results anticipated when it was first instituted fourteen years ago. If it were even minimally successful, we would not seriously be considering so profound a change at this time.

   Although it looked good in theory, the cluster system, as practiced here, has not served the primary need of this educational institution - that is, to efficiently deliver a quality education to our students. So much of the faculty's energy, which should go into teaching, is dissipated trying to get through an administrative maze - just trying to identify lines of responsibility and authority; being shunted from one administrator to another; dealing with administrators who do not have the fundamental practical knowledge of the subject matter about which they must make informed decisions on academic development and problems. The result is poor decisions are made - at best; no decisions are made - at worst.

   OCC has given the cluster system a more than fair trial. It has not proven to be the educational panacea we had all hoped. It is an experiment that failed. It is now time to stop experimenting.

   The cluster system could be modified to minimize the problems we have identified. However, it might take several more years to debug the new system. It is more important that we put our energies into teaching rather than "inventing a new wheel".

2. In reorganizing along division/department lines, OCC would adopt a system that has been used for centuries. We could benefit from its proven assets. We could also draw on our experiences from the cluster system to develop some means of interdisciplinary communication, so that we would not lose its minimal benefits. We could perhaps have the best of both worlds.

   One of the major objectives of the division/departmental system is to build a solid basis of subject matter for students. Community colleges which are organized along the lines of divisions place primary emphasis upon learning rather than research.

   By converting to a division/departmental system, the college would experience no more disruption than that caused by the move from Skokie to Des Plaines.

   In a division/department system staff development would have a more active and important role in education and faculty development programs.

V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Even though the findings of our study reflect our diverse points of view, there are some conclusions and recommendations that the entire committee support.

1. For either system:

   The math and science disciplines need an advocate with a strong math and science background at the administrative level.

   Faculty must play a meaningful role in the review and evaluation of administrators.

   Part-time faculty must be better integrated into their disciplines and the college and must receive substantive review and evaluation.

   There must be better on-going orientation to the college organization and classroom practices for new full-time and part-time faculty.

   Support for interdisciplinary courses should continue.

2. If clusters are retained:

   The large number of full and part-time faculty warrant a minimum of five clusters. We do not favor a reduction to four clusters.

   We do not see the proposed addition of an administrative layer between faculty and deans as a positive solution to our present problems.

   Part-time faculty should be assigned to the cluster of their discipline dean.

3. If we change to divisions/departments:

   If a divisional system is adopted, there must be sincere administrative support for that system.

   Some means of maintaining interdisciplinary contact must be established. For example, a faculty lounge or dining room would be a good meeting place.

   The faculty should have a major part in helping to develop the system.

Oakton
Community
College

Inter-Office
MEMO

Date October 18, 1983

To Board of Trustees

From W. A. Koehnline

Subject Notes on the Faculty Study

Copies to: Committee
Deans
Cabinet
T. Bers
K. Arns
T. Sharrard

The following notes grow out of my critical reading of the "Faculty Study of Pros and Cons of Clusters and Division," and my two-hour meeting with the study committee on October 17. I promised the faculty that I would transmit their document in total and without change. They felt that they were not at liberty to change or correct it. These comments are offered for purposes of clarification, not argument or persuasion.

I. Introduction (page 1)

Paragraph one, second sentence.

The faculty committee intended to say that their study represents the first extensive, substantial effort on the part of the faculty, as distinct from the clusters as faculy-administrative units, to solicit and record faculty thinking on the topic of clusters/divisions. They agree that there has been not only individual discussion of this set of topics over the past thirteen years, but also an effort to solicit and discuss faculty opinions within existing clusters, primarily during the spring semester, 1983.

II. Methodology (page 1)

I want to commend the Senate and the committee on the even-handed methodology that was adopted. The intent of the Board on August 9 was by no means as clear as the first paragraph in this section indicated, but it is both diplomatic and simple to assume or impose clear intent where there was none. They proceeded calmly and rationally to do what they thought the Board had asked them to do. It was a commendable procedure.

III. Pro-Cluster

A. Introduction (page 2)

The introduction admirably states the situation as of the current semester. I am very pleased to have us look at this important question seriously in the several forums that are concerned with academic organization.

B. Advantages (page 2)

5. In discussion with the faculty it became clear that the proponents of clusters believed they had asserted that the cluster organization fosters creativity. (I had said that neither section of the study gave the faculty credit for the creative efforts that they and I know are currently in progress--family education, real estate institute, international studies, export education, emeritus program, etc., etc., etc.). This was the point at which the cluster advocates believed they had said the clusters foster creativity. It was part of their intention and I believe it should be made explicit.

D. Conclusion (page 5)

Two important points are made in the first paragraph on page 5. First, the faculty have relatively low confidence in the present deans. Cluster advocates do not attribute personal managerial effectiveness to the system, but to its personnel and implementation. Cluster opponents--that is, division advocates, do not make this distinction.

The second point is that information on the rationale for the cluster system is less widely shared within the college than it was in the early years of the previous decade. As to whether newcomers, particularly full-time faculty and deans, have been properly informed about the organization, this is what I had to say to the committee:

"If screening committees for faculty have neglected to discuss clusters, that is a serious lapse. On the basis of personal experience I can testify that the cluster system was very much a topic of the interview when both Urban Thobe and Tom Zimanzl were employed. The other three current deans were experienced Oakton faculty members before their selection. If there is any failure of understanding by deans, it is due to something more basic than the hiring process."

IV. Pro - Division

A. Introduction (page 6)

In connection with the second paragraph, it should be stated, in fairness, that at least four colleges have adopted systems since 1969, and that two of them have done so in emulation of Oakton Community College.

In connection with the fourth paragraph, I had this to say: "The study asserts that an argument for clusters is that they adapt to one-directional (i.e. upward) change. In fact the argument was and is that clusters adapt to change--that is, either growth or decline--as divisions do not."

The seventh paragraph, dealing with student development, fails to deal with the problem, inherent in the student development model, of how to assign counselors to teaching units in a divisional system. While the student development faculty member on the committee understands this problem, she was unable to influence the committee as a whole to deal with it.

The point of the final paragraph of this section, which I missed in what I thought was a careful reading, is that it is baccalaureate faculty who care about academic organization. It would have been equally true for the committee to have said and the majority of teachers supporting the cluster system are teachers of baccalaureate transfer subjects. The pro-cluster and pro-division sub-groups did not necessarily address the same aspects of their respective topics, even when parallelism was possible.

B. Advantages

(page 7)

4. The implication is made that we are currently unable to treat disciplines fairly or to compare our costs, by discipline, with those of other colleges. This is not the case, since we are required to submit a unit cost study by 9/15 each year, the purpose of which is to facilitate intercollege cost comparisons. The degree of accuracy and fairness of the studies in colleges on a divisional system is unknown both to the faculty and to me. David Hilquist believes that such studies are moving in the direction of reliability, but no argument can be based upon them at the present time.

8. The assertion that student development faculty are "already departmentalized" is somewhat less than a half-truth. If student development were part of one division, it would by definition not be part of all divisions. The radical nature of this charge is unrecognized in the statement of advantage.

C. Disadvantages (page 8)

2. The faculty and I disagree on the availability of information on who teaches what. I find the Directory of Courses a useful tool for identifying faculty whose names I have forgotten. They, apparently, do not. A few more pages in the telephone directory, listing faculty by discipline, would be easy to provide. If we continue to have a cluster system, I will see that such information is made widely accessible.

4. The implication is that the departmental--division system is not a political game. This could be said only by persons who have not experienced it. I refer one and all to a book on the subject, such as "Academic Politics" by William R. Brown (U. of Alabama, 1982-LB 2341/.B68/1982)

Between #7 and #8 the system apparently shifts from appearing disorganized and chaotic to apparently being disorganized and chaotic. The neutral word "unusual" is dropped.

9. (page 9)

The next-to-last sentence refers to Leona Roen, a member of the committee, in her role as coordinator of the data processing program, and to the coordinator of staff development (formerly Lynda Jerit, another member of the committee) whose function, the committee maintains, is "administrative" rather than "professional." On this grounds the committee would logically have to be opposed to the employment of Faculty Assistants to the Deans, and to favor the employment of non-faculty to perform the sub-administrative functions of the cluster. As a matter of fact, they emphatically do not.

12. It was said that the document had originally included an appendix which supported the contention that the ratio of non-teaching to teaching personnel is high. Since the appendix was not included in the version transmitted to me, and intended for transmittal to you, it is impossible to assess the validity of the implication that 286:244 is an abnormally or undesirably high ratio.

15. (page 10)

It is in connection with this point that we had dialogue about creativity, to which I referred in my comment on pro-cluster advantage 5, page 2.

D. Conclusions (page 11)

The pro-division writers assured me that the meaning of the last sentence is simply that it is better to make poor decisions than to make no decisions at all. They do not believe they said that no good decisions are made. In the third paragraph, the last sentence was interpreted to mean only "It is time to stop this particular experiment." Nevertheless, I will serve notice that in my recommendation to the Board, I will refer to this sentence in its literal, isolated meaning. I will do so because I believe it is symptomatic, and perhaps more significant than its writers believe it to be.

V. Conclusion and Recommendations (page 12)

The study committee emphasized to me that the advocates of a divisional structure concur with the supporters of clusters in saying that if there are clusters there should be five rather than four units. The faculty remains opposed to restoration of the assistant dean positions. The cluster advocates as well as the supporters of a divisional system agree in recommending that an administrator highly qualified in mathematics and the sciences, and identified with these fields, should be employed. They do not see this as an abandonment of the cluster philosophy.

Finally, the faculty wants to be involved, both in the review of personnel and in the development of whatever system we adopt for the future. As I told the committee, I find this to be an encouraging sign.

ERIC® CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

JUL 6 1984

8118 Math-Sciences Building
Los Angeles, California 90024